

REMARKS

This submission is in response to the Official Action dated March 26, 2007 and the personal interview of July 26, 2007.

At the outset and before addressing the rejection raised in the Official Action, the Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 15 as set forth herein to recite the invention with more particularity and to obviate the rejections set forth in the Official Action. Support for the amendments is provided in the specification as filed at least on page 5, lines 13-17 in view of FIG. 2, page 6, lines 9-28 in view of FIG. 4, and page 7, lines 12-16 in view of FIG. 6 (emphasis added). The Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter has been entered via the foregoing amendments to the pending claims.

Claims 1 and 15 are amended; claims 8, 10-14 and 20 are cancelled. Consequently, claims 1-7, 9 and 15-19 are now pending in this application.

Interview Summary

The Applicants thank the Examiner Ryan Hsu and Primary Examiner John Hotaling for the courtesy of an interview on July 26, 2007 with Applicants' representatives, including the undersigned, Alexander G. Vodovozov. The undersigned propounded that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest "a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel," as particularly recited in independent claims 1 and 15. However, the Examiners posited that the different method of grounding did not necessarily offer unexpected result and may have been a simple matter of design choice.

As will become clear in view of arguments presented hereinbelow, the Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as recited in claims 1 and 15 obviates the impedance (or improves discharge) of electromagnetic radiation of the prior art that is present at a contact point between the panel and the ground lead wire (Wachi) or bracket (Takahashi), and improves electromagnetic shielding from that of the prior art. More specifically, in the present invention, electromagnetic radiation from inside the gaming machine or ambient electromagnetic radiation

from outside the gaming machine may easily dissipate from incidence thereof on the panel or the bezel through a shortest path to the bezel because they are in electrical contact, while in the prior art the electromagnetic radiation may only dissipate through the ground lead (Wachi) or bracket (Takahashi), thereby presenting impedance at the point of contact with the ground lead or bracket. In the prior art, the electromagnetic radiation would need to travel from the point of incidence, around the periphery of the panel, to the point of contact with the ground lead or the bracket in order to discharge or dissipate through the same. This impedance of the prior art may also create a loop antenna through the periphery of the panel, inducing additional unwanted electromagnetic radiation that may affect the operation of the gaming machine. Furthermore, electrically contacting the panel with the bezel improves the shielding effect of the bezel/panel combination of the claimed invention, whereas in the prior art there would be a unshielded seam that is present between the panel and the bezel which would allow unwanted radiation to penetrate into or escape from the gaming machine. Any unwanted impedance or radiation from whatever source may cause interference with the gaming machine. Consequently, the claimed invention as recited at least in claims 1 and 15 obviates the impedance at point of contact and the radiation at the seam, both of which are present in the prior art, and thereby allows the gaming machine to comply with regulatory requirements for radiation in gaming machines.

§112 Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 20

Claims 1-9 and 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as incomplete for omitting essential elements directed to a game machine.

The Applicant have amended independent claim 1 (claims 8 and 20 cancelled) to recite “a processor operative to cause a wagering game to be displayed on the visual display,” as particularly recited in claim 1. The Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, includes essential elements pertinent to the claimed invention.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 1 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, of claims 2-7 and 9 (claim 8 cancelled), based at least on their respective dependencies from independent claim 1.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15-16 and 18-19

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15-16 and 18-19 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly anticipated by Wachi, *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,833,665) (hereinafter “Wachi”).

The primary prior art reference to Wachi is directed to a flat display panel with a front protection plate. As shown in FIG. 1, the flat display panel 1 comprises a flat display panel main body 2 and a front protective plate 3. More specifically, the front protective plate 3 comprises an antireflection layer 6, a translucent electrically conductive layer 5, *containing a metal having an electromagnetic wave shielding property and a near infrared ray shielding property*, a highly rigid transparent substrate 4 made of a tempered glass or a semi-tempered glass and an adhesive layer 7 laminated in this order, bonded to the viewer’s side surface of the flat display panel main body 2 by means of the adhesive layer 7. An electrode 8 is connected to the translucent electrically conductive layer 5 for ground lead connection, inducing an electric current generated in the electrically conductive layer 5 resulting from electromagnetic waves emitted from the flat display panel main body 2 to the ground lead. The electrode 8 is provided on the entire periphery of the substrate 4. (See Wachi, Col. 8, lines 8-21).

In traversing the rejection of independent claims 1 and 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Applicants respectfully submit that the primary prior art reference to Wachi is defective in that it fails to disclose, much less teach or suggest “a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel,” as particularly recited in independent claims 1 and 15. In the rejection of claim 8 (subject matter of which has been incorporated into claim 1) on page 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner alleged that Wachi in FIGS. 1-3 discloses the recited bezel. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Wachi does not disclose a bezel at all. Instead Wachi discloses a panel only. More specifically, Wachi’s flat display panel 1 (comprising a main body 2 and a front protection plate 3) is not a “bezel” but a combination of “layers” disposed on one another, including antireflection layer 6, translucent conductive layer 5, conductive layer 4, transparent substrate 7, and main body 2, as shown in Wachi, FIG. 1. A

bezel is a term or art, just like a layer. That is, the recited bezel encompasses the panel (See FIG. 3, 4 and 6, ref. no. 28), whereas Wachi's layers comprise or form the panel (Wachi, FIG. 1).

Consequently, the Wachi fails to disclose, much less teach or suggest "a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 and 15, as amended.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 2, 6-7, 16, and 18-19 (claim 8, 10-11, and 13 cancelled), based at least on their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 15.

§103 Rejection of Claims 5, 12, and 17

Claims 5, 12, and 17 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wachi in further view of Takahashi, *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,884,936) (hereinafter "Takahashi").

The secondary prior art reference to Takahashi is directed to an electromagnetic shield film, electromagnetic shield unit, and display. More specifically, in FIG. 4-7, Takahashi teaches a front plate 7 that includes at least the electromagnetic shield unit 6 with electromagnetic shield film 1, a bracket 71 attached to peripheral edge of the electromagnetic shield unit 6, and a bezel (escutcheon) 70 via which the electromagnetic shield unit 6 is attached using the bracket 71. (See Takahashi, Col9, lines 39-46). The bracket 71 is provided with a plurality of regularly spaced grips 711, and joint 712 joining the grips 711. The grips 711 elastically hold the front and rear surfaces of the electromagnetic wave shield unit 6 and are in electrical contact with earth portion 5 of the electromagnetic shield film 1. The earth portion 5 surrounds the periphery of the conductor 4 of the electromagnetic shield film 1. (See Takahashi, Col 8, line 24-28 in view of FIG.1) The grips are made of a metal or an alloy since they have to be at least conductive and elastic. (See Takahashi, co. 9, lines 47-55) The bezel 70 is shaped similarly to the electromagnetic wave shield unit 6, and has a peripheral edge 701 into which the electromagnetic

wave shield unit 6 is fitted and an opening 702. The bezel is made of resin, metal or alloy in order to be easily molded. (See Takahashi, Co. 9, liens 56-60). The earth portion 5 of the electromagnetic shield film 1 is grounded via bracket 71 attached to the front plate 7. (See Takahashi, Col. 10, lines 2-6)

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 5 and 17 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wachi-Takahashi combination is defective in that it fails to teach or suggest “a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel,” as particularly recited in claims 1 and 15, as amended, from which claims 5 and 17 (claim 12 cancelled) depend respectively.

The defect of the primary prior art reference to Wachi was argued hereinabove with reference to the § 102 rejection. The Applicants respectfully reiterate that Wachi does not teach or suggest a bezel that encompasses the panel and that is coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, wherein the conductive material of the bezel is in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel, as particularly recited in claims 1 and 15. The secondary prior art reference to Takahashi does not rectify the deficiency identified in Wachi. The Applicants first respectfully submit that Takahashi simply does not teach or suggest coating or impregnating the bezel to provide electromagnetic shielding. More specifically, although Takahashi's discloses a bezel 70, its bezel is not coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, as recited in claims 1 and 15. The Applicants further respectfully submit that Takahashi does not teach or suggest its bezel 70 being in electrical contact with the wave shield film 1 of the electromagnetic shield unit 6. Instead, Takahashi teaches that the grips 711 of bracket 71 elastically hold the front and rear surfaces of the electromagnetic wave shield unit 6 and are in electrical contact with earth portion 5 of the electromagnetic shield film 1 (grounding conductor 4), wherein the earth portion 5 surrounds the periphery conductor 4 of the electromagnetic shield film 1 (See Takahashi FIG. 1).

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the applied prior art references to Wachi and Takahashi recognizes coating or impregnating the bezel with conductive material to

provide electromagnetic shielding and further neither of the prior art references recognizes electrically contacting the bezel with the panel to provide electromagnetic shielding. The applied prior art references are limited to grounding its layered panel by surrounding its periphery with electrodes, but neither prior art reference recognizes providing electromagnetic shielding by coating or impregnating the bezel with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference and contacting the conductive material of the bezel with the conductive material of the panel, as particularly recited in claims 1 and 15. It is submitted that costly elements such as surrounding the periphery with electrodes, the bracket, and the like may be eliminated. Furthermore, the impedance presented at the ground lead of Wachi or at the ground-bracket of Takahashi from an electromagnetic event that presents interference in a gaming machine is obviated by the claimed invention as argued above. Lastly, neither of the references recognizes that the unshielded seam that is present in applied prior art between the panel and the bezel would allow interference penetrate into or from the respective displays (e.g., gaming machine). However, the claimed electrical contact between the panel and the bezel obviates this deficiency in the prior art as argued above. The arguments presented in the Interview Summary above are incorporated herein by reference.

Consequently, the Wachi-Takahashi combinations fails to teach or suggest “a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel,” as particularly recited in independent claims 1 and 15 from which claims 5 and 17 depend respectively.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 5 and 17 (claim 12 cancelled) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based at least on their respective dependencies from independent Claims 1 and 15.

§103 Rejection of Claims 5, 12, and 17

Claims 3-4, 9 and 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wachi in further view of Schneider, *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,089,976) (hereinafter “Schneider”).

The tertiary prior art reference to Schneider is directed to a gaming apparatus and method including player interactive bonus game. The gaming apparatus and method include a primary game and a player interactive bonus game actuated by a qualifying outcome of the primary game and including a bonus award display showing a multiplicity of images displayed on a video monitor from which a player selects until achieving a pair of matched bonus awards.

In traversing the rejection of claims 3-4 and 9 (claim 20 cancelled) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Applicants respectfully submit that the Wachi-Takahashi combination is defective in that it fails to teach or suggest “a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel,” as particularly recited in claim 1, as amended, from which claims 3-4 and 9 (claim 20 cancelled) depend respectively. The defects of the primary prior art reference to Wachi were argued hereinabove with reference to the Interview Summary and the §§ 102, 103(a) rejections. The Applicants respectfully reiterate that Wachi does not teach or suggest a bezel that encompasses the panel and that is coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, wherein the conductive material of the bezel is in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel, as particularly recited in claim 1 and argued above in reference to the Interview Summary and the §§ 102, 103(a) rejections. The tertiary prior art reference to Schneider, directed to a gaming apparatus, does not rectify the deficiencies identified in Wachi.. Even if *arguendo* Wachi’s panel were incorporated in Schneider, the combination would still be defective for at least the reasons identified in respect to Wachi hereinabove.

Consequently, the Wachi-Schneider combination fails to teach or suggest “a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel,” as particularly recited in independent claim 1, as amended, from which claims 3-4 and 9 depend respectively.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-4 and 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based at least on their respective dependencies from independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and further earnestly request notification to that effect. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at (516) 203-7270 to facilitate the allowance of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL J. SOSNOSKI.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(516) 203-7270

Date August 27, 2007

By / Alexander G. Vodovozov
Alexander G. Vodovozov
Reg. No. 55,701

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 27 day of August 2007.

Name

Peter Rebuffoni

Signature

Peter Rebuffoni